



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
06/725,206	04/19/85	JEFFIERY	J EDDOTS12CONTI

JACOBS & JACOBS, P.C.  
521 FIFTH AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10175

EXAMINER	
OSHAVER, P	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
124	8
DATE MAILED 1/22/86	

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined       Responsive to communication filed on \_\_\_\_\_       This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s),        days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1.  Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.      2.  Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.  
3.  Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449      4.  Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152  
5.  Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474      6.

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1.  Claims 1624, 42549, and 52 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.

2.  Claims 25-41, 50, and 51 have been cancelled.

3.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.

4.  Claims 1624, 42549, and 52 are rejected.

5.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.

6.  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7.  This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.

8.  Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9.  The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. These drawings are  acceptable;  
 not acceptable (see explanation).

10.  The  proposed drawing correction and/or the  proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_  
has (have) been  approved by the examiner.  disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11.  The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been  approved.  disapproved (see explanation). However,  
the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are  
corrected. Corrections **MUST** be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO  
EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.

12.  Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has  been received  not been received  
 been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

13.  Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in  
accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14.  Other

Claims 1 to 24, 42 to 49, and 52 are directed to the same invention as that of claims 1 to 29 of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 4,443,449. The issue of priority under 35 U.S.C. 102(g) and possibly 35 U.S.C. 102(f) of this single invention must be resolved.

Since the Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see M.P.E.P. 1101.01(b)), the assignee is required to state which entity is the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. A terminal disclaimer has no effect in this situation since the basis for refusing more than one patent is priority of invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) and (g) and not an extension of monopoly.

Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of the application.

Claims 1 to 24, 42 to 49, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1 to 29 of prior U.S. Patent No. 4,443,449.

This is a double patenting rejection.

Claims 1 to 24, 42 to 49 and 52 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the prior invention as set forth in claims 1, 3 to 7, 9 to 13, 15 to 24, 42, 50, and 51 are of U.S. patent no. 725,129 in view of 4,443,449.

Art Unit 142

4,443,449 teaches the equivalence of 1-6C alkyls  
with respect to R<sub>1</sub>.

Applicants' attention is directed to claims 30 to 32  
of 4,443,449 and claims 1 to 29 of 4,522,828.

Shaver/k1  
703/557-3920  
12-21-85

*Paul F. Shaver*

PAUL F. SHAVER  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP ART UNIT 124